UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/802,698	03/09/2001	Johan Soderberg	032559-077	6898

27045 7590 06/14/2005

ERICSSON INC.
6300 LEGACY DRIVE
M/S EVR C11
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER	
ABRAHAM, ESAW T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2133	

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/802,698	SODERBERG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Esaw T. Abraham	2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 March 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21 and 29-57* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21 and 29-57* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 March 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Final office action

Response to the applicant's amendments

Applicant's argument/amendments with respect to original claims 1-21 and 29-57 filed on 03/21/05 have been fully considered but are not persuasive to overcome 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections over Koodli (6,608,841). The examiner would like to point out that this action is made final (MPEP 706.07a).

The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection made in the previous office action to reject claims 1-57 is withdrawn in response to the Applicant's Remarks and Arguments.

Response to the applicant's argument

In response to the applicant's argument that the reference fail to show certain features of applicants invention, and further the examiner has not pointed out to any teaching, suggestion in Koodli of such functionality, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (For example; the applicant argues that, "forwarding compressed packets with detected errors at the link layer upwards in the protocol stack for higher-level error protection; the protocol stack resides within one physical node") are not fully recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Note: claim 1 recites, "forwarding compressed packets with detected errors at the link layer upwards in the protocol stack for higher-level error protection" and does not state "forwarding compressed packets with detected errors at the link layer upwards in the protocol stack for higher-level error protection; **the protocol stack resides within one physical node**").

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **1-21 and 29-57** remained pending and claims 22-28 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere* CO., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. Claims **1-21 and 29-57** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koodli (6,608,841).

As per claims **1 and 29,** Koodli teach or disclose a data compression/decompression in a data network and more particularly, relates to a system and method for achieving robust IP/UDP/RTP header compression in the presence of unreliable networks (see col. 1, lines 1-15). Koodli teaches a robust IP/UDP/RTP header compression mechanism and technique that can correctly reconstruct IP/UDP/RTP headers in the presence of packet losses and errors whereby the header compression mechanism includes a compressor/de-compressor (header compression

analyzer) implemented for operation similarly to RFC 2508 but designed specifically to address robustness when employed in lossy and error-prone networks to correctly reconstruct headers in the presence of packet losses and errors (see col. 3, 31-40). Further, Koodli in FIG. 2A show an example of data packet (100) consists of a segment of data payload (130) and a small header (120) whereby the header segment (120) contains, for example, IP addresses fields (32-bit global Internet address, generally consisting of a network identifier and a host identifier), a version field used to specify which version of the IP is represented in the IP packet (for example, IPv4 and IP v6), a type of service field used to specify how the IP packet is to be handled in IP-based networks which offer various service qualities, and a header checksum field used to verify transmission error (see col. 5, lines 39-65). Koodli **does not explicitly teach** forwarding a header-compressed packet with a checksum by a forwarding means. **However,** Koodli in figure 1 teaches a source terminal (20) comprising a host (22) generates data which is forwarded to the network interface controller (NIC) (24) and the NIC (24) of the source terminal (20) transforms incoming data from host (22) into data packets using, for example, Real-Time Transfer Protocol (RTP) used on top of User Datagram Protocol (UDP/IP), and injects the data packets via the bandwidth-limited link 10 and further the IP-based network (10) accepts incoming data packets and forwards the same to destination terminal (30) according to the information contained in the header (see col. 5, lines 21-37) which Koodli is basically teaching the same as the applicant's invention for routing or forwarding header compressed packets. **Therefore,** it would have been obvious to a person having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to route or forward header compressed packets from a source to a destination as taught by Koodli. **This**

modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated in order to enhance link or channel performance.

As per claims **2 and 30,** Koodli teach a type of service field used to specify how the IP packet is to be handled in IP-based networks which offer various service qualities, and a header checksum field used to verify transmission error (see col. 5, lines 50-54).

As per claims **3-6,** Koodli teach the header compression mechanism includes a header compression mechanism is implemented to correctly reconstruct headers of said packets in the presence of packet losses and errors (see claim 18).

As per claims **7 and 35,** Koodli teach a robust IP/UDP/RTP header compression mechanism and technique that can correctly reconstruct IP/UDP/RTP headers in the presence of packet losses and errors. The header compression mechanism includes a compressor/de-compressor implemented for operation similarly to RFC 2508 but designed specifically to address robustness when employed in lossy and error-prone networks to correctly reconstruct headers in the presence of packet losses and errors (see col. 3, lines 31-40).

As per claim **8, 9, 36 and 37,** Koodli teach that headers are IP/UDP/RTP headers used for real-time communications on the Internet and for applications such as Voice over IP and Video conferencing (see claim 9).

As per claims **10, 12 and 14,** Koodli teach a type of service field used to specify how the IP packet is to be handled in IP-based networks which offer various service qualities, and a header checksum field used to verify transmission error (see col. 5, lines 50-54).

As per claims **11 and 39,** Koodli in figure 5A teach a header format of a data packet when a second-order (SO) difference is zero and the header segment 120 of a data packet 100

(see FIG. 2A) may include a 4-bit context identifier (ID) field (which is the same as described in RFC 2508 and may be implicit and optional in certain networks such as cellular networks) and a 4-bit sequence number field (see col.9, lines 38-53).

As per claims **13 and 41,** Koodli teaches a version field used to specify which version of the IP is represented in the IP packet (for example, IP Version 4 and IP Version 6), a type of service field used to specify how the IP packet is to be handled in IP-based networks which offer various service qualities, and a header checksum field used to verify transmission error. Other IP fields such as flags and fragment offset fields, a total length field, an ID field, a time to live field and a protocol field may also be included in such a header and in the Internet Protocol version 4 (IPv4), header fields including IP/UDP/RTP may occupy 40 bytes per packet, and 60 bytes per packet for Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6) (see col. 5, 38-65).

As per claims **15 and 16,** Koodli teaches header compression mechanism includes a compressor/de-compressor implemented for operation similarly to RFC 2508 but designed specifically to address robustness when employed in lossy and error-prone networks to correctly reconstruct headers in the presence of packet losses and errors (see col. 3, lines 31-40).

As per claims **17 and 45,** Koodli teaches that when the context state is established, the compressor 26 of source terminal 20 need not send the first-order differences (especially those corresponding to RTP header fields, for example, such as RTP timestamp and RTP sequence number) unless the second-order difference (delta) is non-zero and when the second-order difference (delta) of the RTP header (or IP/UDP header of a data packet) from packet to packet is zero, the de-compressor 36 of destination terminal 30 may reconstruct a packet without any loss of information by simply adding the first-order differences to the saved uncompressed

header representing the previous packet as each compressed packet is received (see col. 7, lines 5-16).

As per claims **18, 19, 46 and 47,** Koodli teach a type of service field used to specify how the IP packet is to be handled in IP-based networks which offer various service qualities, and a header checksum field used to verify transmission error (see col. 5, lines 50-54).

As per claims **20-21 and 48-49,** Koodli teaches all the subject matter claimed in claims 1 and 29. Kooldi **does not teach** that a framing protocol PPP and a HDLC protocol. **Nevertheless,** as would have been well known to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, such protocols for example, Point-to-Point Protocol, is a network level protocol required in wide usage today that enables general-purpose computers to communicate over certain packet switched networks. **Accordingly,** it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to include such protocols in order to communicate over packet switched networks.

As per claims **31-34,** Koodli teach the header compression mechanism includes a header compression mechanism is implemented to correctly reconstruct headers of said packets in the presence of packet losses and errors (see claim 18).

As per claims **38, 40, and 42,** Koodli teach a type of service field used to specify how the IP packet is to be handled in IP-based networks which offer various service qualities, and a header checksum field used to verify transmission error (see col. 5, lines 50-54).

As per claims **43 and 44,** Koodli teaches a header compression mechanism includes a compressor/de-compressor implemented for operation similarly to RFC 2508 but designed specifically to address robustness when employed in lossy and error-prone networks to correctly reconstruct headers in the presence of packet losses and errors (see col. 3, lines 31-40).

As per claim **50,** Koodli teaches all the subject matter claimed in claims 1 and 20 including Koodli teaches that for Internet Protocol (IP) based real-time multimedia, RTP may be used on top of User Datagram Protocol (UDP/IP) to make use of multiplexing and checksum services (see col. 1, lines 27-30).

As per claim **51,** Koodli in figure 5A teach a header format of a data packet when a second-order (SO) difference is zero and the header segment 120 of a data packet 100 (see FIG. 2A) may include a 4-bit context identifier (ID) field (which is the same as described in RFC 2508 and may be implicit and optional in certain networks such as cellular networks) and a 4-bit sequence number field (see col.9, lines 38-53).

As per claim **52,** Koodli teach a type of service field used to specify how the IP packet is to be handled in IP-based networks, which offer various service qualities, and a header checksum field used to verify transmission error (see col. 5, lines 50-54).

As per claims **53-56,** Koodli teach a type of service field used to specify how the IP packet is to be handled in IP-based networks, which offer various service qualities, and a header checksum field used to verify transmission error (see col. 5, lines 50-54). Further, Koodli teaches a version field used to specify which version of the IP is represented in the IP packet (for example, IP Version 4 and IP Version 6), a type of service field used to specify how the IP packet is to be handled in IP-based networks which offer various service qualities, and a header checksum field used to verify transmission error. Other IP fields such as flags and fragment offset fields, a total length field, an ID field, a time to live field and a protocol field may also be included in such a header and in the Internet Protocol version 4 (IPv4), header fields including

IP/UDP/RTP may occupy 40 bytes per packet, and 60 bytes per packet for Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6) (see col. 5, 38-65).

As per claim **57,** Koodli teaches header compression mechanism includes a compressor/de-compressor implemented for operation similarly to RFC 2508 but designed specifically to address robustness when employed in lossy and error-prone networks to correctly reconstruct headers in the presence of packet losses and errors (see col. 3, lines 31-40).

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Esaw Abraham whose telephone number is (571) 272-3812. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are successful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306.

Esaw Abraham

Esaw Abraham

Art unit: 2133

ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100